## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application is respectfully requested.

In response to the Official Action, claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended as set forth above. Support for the amendments may be found at page 5, lines 18 - 22, as well as at other places in the specification and drawings. Accordingly, claims 1, 4, 6, 10, 11, 13-19, and 21-23 are pending in the application.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of the present application.

Claims 1, 4, 11, 13-14, and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,727,135, hereinafter *Webb*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,937,148, hereinafter *Okazawa*. The Examiner alleges that *Webb* teaches a plurality of printers and a plurality of computers, each of which are connected to a print server. The Examiner alleges that element 21 of *Webb* is a print server. However, in contrast to the assertions made in the Official Action, the element 21 in *Webb* is merely a local area network. As one of ordinary skill in the art would know, the local area network 21 is merely a communication channel used to transmit signals back and forth between a host computer 11 and a printer 16. See column 11, lines 1-10. The local area network 21 of *Webb* does not perform the function of a print server, and is clearly not a print server.

Furthermore, the claim 1 has been amended to define that the print server gathers the status of each of the printers and sends the gathered status to each of the plurality of computers. The print server (i.e., the LAN 21 in *Webb*) has no capability of gathering

data from the printers. The local area network 21 of *Webb* is merely a communication channel used to transmit signals back and forth between a host computer 11 and a printer 16. See column 11, lines 1-10. The local area network 21 of *Webb* does not perform any gathering function, and, as set forth above, is clearly not a print server.

The Examiner's attention is also directed to the fact that the Printer State Manager 140 in *Webb* is part of the microprocessor based controller 72 of the printer. See Figure 3 which illustrates that the Printer State Manager 140 is part of the microprocessor based controller 72. And, see column 9, lines 59-60, which indicates that the controller 72 is part of the printer. Accordingly, *Webb* does not teach or suggest a print server that gathers and sends the status of the printers to each of the computers.

Accordingly, the portions of *Webb* relied upon by the Examiner do not teach the asserted portions of amended claim 1.

Furthermore, even if *Okazawa* was combined with *Webb*, the subject matter of claim 1 would still not be taught or suggested. For example, *Okazawa* teaches that, in response to receipt of printing data, or in response to an inquiry from the host computer, the status of a printer can be obtained. See step 11 in Figure 4 and the related description at column 7, lines 51-56. See also step 21 in Figure 5 and the related description thereof at column 8, lines 26-38. Specifically, *Okazawa* only teaches that the status of the printers is obtained upon receipt of printing data or a request from a host computer.

With regard to *Okazawa*, the Examiner relies upon column 11, line 57 through column 12, line 5. However, this designated section merely indicates that the printer server acquires the status of a corresponding printer and informs the status to *an* inquiring

host computer. This section does not in any way relate to the sending of status of a plurality of printers to a plurality of computers. The Examiner further relies upon Figure 7, which displays the status. However, the displaying of the status is quite different than the sending of the status.

Accordingly, neither *Webb*, nor *Okazawa*, teaches or suggests the subject matter of claim 1, which includes, among other elements, a print server connected to a plurality of printers and a plurality of computers, wherein the print server includes a job observation module for monitoring and gathering the status of the plurality of printers connected to the print server, and sends the gathered status to the plurality of computers.

In responding to the rejection of claim 1, Applicant has not addressed the propriety of the combination of *Webb* and *Okazawa* because even if the two references are combined, there is no teaching of the subject matter of claim 1. However, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the combination of *Webb* and *Okazawa* at a later time, if necessary or appropriate.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1, and is thus patentable over the combination of *Webb* and *Okazawa* at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 11 defines a method of controlling a print system that includes the steps of gathering a status of a plurality of printers with a print server; and sending the gathered status of the plurality of printers to a plurality of computers connected to the print server, the status being displayed at each of the plurality of computers.

As set forth above, *Webb* does not teach or suggest a print server connected to a plurality of printers and a plurality of computers. Furthermore, neither *Webb* nor *Okazawa*

teaches the step of sending the gathered status of the plurality of printers to a plurality of
computers. Accordingly, claim 11 is also not taught or suggested by the references cited
by the Examiner.

Claims 13-14 depend from claim 11, and are thus also patentable over the prior art
at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 11.

Claim 22 defines a print server adapted to be connected to a plurality of printers
and a plurality of computers, the print server comprising a job observation module for
monitoring and gathering the status of the plurality of printers; and a device for notifying
each of the plurality of computers of the gathered status of the plurality of printers. Claim
22 is patentable over the prior art at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to
claim 11, i.e., the references do not teach the use of a print server for notifying each of the
plurality of computers of the gathered status of a plurality of printers.

Claims 6 and 15-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being
unpatentable over the combination of *Webb* and *Okazawa* as applied to claims 1 and 11,
and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,669,040, issued to *Hisatake*. The Examiner
relies upon the teaching of *Hisatake* only for allegedly teaching a waiting time for the
printer which is displayed in the status monitor.

As set forth in the response filed in this application on September 24, 2001,
Applicant explained that *Hisatake* also does not teach the monitoring of a waiting time for
the printer. At best, *Hisatake* reveals the number of pages in a particular print job.
However, given that each printer may print at a different speed, and that each page may
take a different amount of time, *Hisatake* does not teach or suggest a waiting time for the

print jobs.  In the event that the Examiner maintains the rejection based on *Hisatake*, the Examiner is respectfully requested to more carefully point out how or why *Hisatake* teaches of suggests the waiting time for a printer.

Nevertheless, *Hisatake* does not overcome the deficiency of the rejection of the base claims based on *Webb* and *Okazawa*.  Accordingly, claims 6 and 15-16 are also patentable over *Webb* and *Okazawa* and *Hisatake*.

Claims 17-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Webb* and *Okazawa*, as applied to claim 11, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,213,652, issued to *Suzuki et al.*  The Examiner relies upon *Suzuki et al.* for its alleged teaching that the computers and print server exchange registration requests and response. Accordingly, *Suzuki et al.* does not overcome the deficiency of the rejection of the base claim based on *Webb* and *Okazawa*.  Furthermore, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the Examiner's understanding of the alleged teachings of *Suzuki* at a later time, if necessary and appropriate.

Claims 10, 21, and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Webb*, and *Okazawa* as applied to the base claims, and *Hamazaki*.

The Examiner relies upon *Hamazaki* for its alleged teaching of a print server that includes means for calculating a waiting time for availability of a printer.  Accordingly, *Hamazaki* does not overcome the deficiency of the rejection of the base claims based on *Webb* and *Okazawa*.

Furthermore, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the Examiner's allegations concerning the teachings of *Hamazaki* at a later time, if necessary and appropriate.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this Amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: _William C Rowland_

William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: January 18, 2002

**Attachment to Amendment dated January 18, 2002**

**Mark-up of Claims 1, 11, and 21**

1.   (Twice Amended)  A print system, comprising:

a print server;

a plurality of printers connected to the print server;

a plurality of computers connected to the print server;

the print server includes a job observation module for monitoring and gathering the

status of the plurality of printers connected to the print server, and sends the gathered

status to the plurality of computers; and

each of the computers includes a status monitor for displaying the status [which is

sent simultaneously from the print server to each of the computers].

11.  (Twice Amended)  A method of controlling a print system, comprising the steps of:

gathering [obtaining] a status of a plurality of printers with a print server; and

[simultaneously] sending the gathered [obtained] status of the plurality of printers to

a plurality of computers connected to the print server, the status being displayed at each of

the plurality of computers.

22.   (Amended) A print server adapted to be connected to a plurality of printers and a

plurality of computers, the print server comprising:

a job observation module for monitoring and gathering the status of the plurality of

printers; and

### Attachment to Amendment dated January 18, 2002

## Mark-up of Claims 1, 11, and 21

a device for [simultaneously] notifying each of the plurality of computers of the

gathered status of the plurality of printers.